

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated November 10, 2005, the Examiner objected to an informality on page 8, line 3, of the specification. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. patent no. 6,718,500) and rejected claims 7, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Chang (U.S. patent no. 6,956,855). The Examiner allowed claims 1-4 and 9-12. The rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-4 and 9-12.

The Examiner objected to an informality on page 8, line 3, of the specification, noting that the specification references a step 307 in FIG. 7 but that FIG. 7 does not include a step 307. The applicants have amended the specification to instead reference step 701. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lee. Claim 5 has been amended to clarify the claim, that is, to provide for receiving a negative acknowledgment (NAK) from the remote unit indicating that the final data frame was improperly received, retransmitting the final data frame, and sending no more idle frames after the retransmission of the final data frame in response to the determination that the final data frame was improperly received.

These features of claim 5 are not taught by Lee, as Lee merely teaches a transmission of a prior art number of idle frames. That is, when a negative acknowledgment is received, the system taught by Lee will stop sending idle frames and retransmit the improperly received frame. However, immediately after the retransmission is sent, a previously set number (N) of idle frames will be sent if there is no data to send, as per the prior art. By contrast, claim 5 provides that after the retransmission of an improperly received final data frame, no more idle frames will be sent. Therefore, Lee does not teach the features of claim 5 of receiving a negative acknowledgment (NAK)

from the remote unit indicating that the final data frame was improperly received, retransmitting the final data frame, and sending no more idle frames after the retransmission of the final data frame in response to the determination that the final data frame was improperly received. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 5 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 6 and 7 depend upon allowable claim 5, the applicants respectfully request that claims 6 and 7 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 13 teaches an apparatus comprising a logic circuit that determines that a final data frame has been transmitted to a remote unit and instructs a transmitting circuitry to send no more idle frames if the NAK'd data frame is requesting retransmission of the final data frame. By contrast and as described in detail above, Lee teaches that a previously set number (N) of idle frames are transmitted after retransmission of the final data frame. Therefore, Lee does not teach the logic circuit of claim 13. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 13 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 14 and 15 depend upon allowable claim 13, the applicants respectfully request that claims 14 and 15 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 8 provides for receiving multiple data frames, determining that a data frame was improperly received, sending a NAK in response to the determination that the data frame was improperly received, receiving an idle frame, and sending an acknowledgment (ACK) in response to the received idle frame. In rejecting claim 8, the Examiner contended that Lee teaches transmitting idle frames when there is no frame to transmit (col. 1, lines 59-62), transmitting an ACK in response to a transmitted information frame and retransmitting the information frame if the ACK is not received in a predetermined amount of time (col. 7, lines 36-38). But all Lee is teaching here is an ACK to a data frame. Nowhere does Lee teach, nor does the Examiner even contend that Lee teaches, an ACK of an idle frame. Therefore, Lee does not teach the feature of claim 8 of sending an ACK in response to a received idle frame. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 8 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 16 teaches a remote unit comprising an ACK/NAK generator for generating an ACK in response to idle frames received. As noted above, Lee does not teach such an ACK/NAK generator. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 16 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 17 and 18 depend upon allowable claim 16, the applicants respectfully request that claims 17 and 18 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,
John Harris et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750